REMARKS

Claim 30 has been objected to because the word "bonder" should be "binder." Claim 30 has been corrected to correct this error.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, This rejection is respectfully traversed. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that specific values for (D) and (C) are critical but not included in the claims or disclosure. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The recited limitation is discussed on page 20, line 30 – page 21, line 19 of the specification. Specifically, the specification states that the "rate of change in radius of a halftone dot after IR ablation is defined by the following formulas:

A>B rate of change (%)=(A-B)/B×(D-C)×100

B>A rate of change (%)=(A-B)/A×(D-C)×100

wherein a halftone dot radius when a certain value (D) of laser energy is irradiated is (A), and the halftone dot radius when a laser energy is changed to an option value (C) is (B)."

As described in the specification, (D) and (C) are variable amounts of laser energy. To determine the rate of change in radius of a halftone dot after IR ablation, all that is required is that the chosen values for (D) and (C) are not the same. They need not be predefined numbers because each laser energy will produce a dot radius that is **proportionate** to its laser energy. For Example, the dot radius produced with laser energy (D) is (A) and the dot radius produced with laser energy (C) is (B).

The Examiner states that there is no specific guidance provided for selecting the laser energies (D) and (C), and different values for these variables will produce different values for the rate of change. This is incorrect since the rate of change is a proportion of dot radius and laser energy. Choosing a larger energy (D) will produce a corresponding larger radius (A), which will counteract the selection of the larger (D) in the rate of change. Similarly choosing a larger laser energy (C) will produce a larger radius (B), which will counteract the selection of the larger (C). Accordingly, choosing different values for these variables will not produce different values for the

rate of change as contended by the Examiner. Since the specification enables one to chose values for (D) and (C), claim 24 is enabled by the specification.

Claims 18, 19, 22, 25 and 26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-7 and 13 of copending Application No. 10/279,005. An appropriate terminal disclaimer accompanies this response. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

A supplemental application data sheet accompanies this amendment. The supplemental application data sheet lists an earlier application that this application claims the benefit of under 35 USC 120.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 358362010601.

Dated: June 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jonathan Bockman
Registration No.: 45,640
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7769

va-111902